

Hi velocity translational skiing and the **beam-people-there**  
**Transporter.** Could phonons, plasmons (arrays of atoms and holes that move; physically translate, while retaining order), or higher velocity spintronic equivalents, propagate information as little plasmonic groups cross edges through a medium, possibly a preservative or amplifying medium, to transport the specific layout of atoms, and just possibly some of their quantum states to a Reader like a 3d embroidery hoop or coating surrounding the object. The plasmons migrating might have error-reduction bitwise operations similar to a cellular automata to preclude data dilution with propagation out to the plasmon reader coating.

I hard about something called

spintronics; does spintronics have a plasmon/phonon equivalent?  
Spintronics could be much higher velocity than electron hole plasmons.

Plasmon/phonon data reporting transporter Applications such as knowing what is inside a crystal could possibly go with **new radiation, particle, and vibration (like Thz), EM, detectors to make new kinds of sensors**. New kinds of sensors benefits robots and automation.

It is well travelled at things I write, but could the new scientist quantum camera that makes a figurine outline from quantum-entangled photon absorption at the figurine surface simulataneously at the sensing surface of the computer camera to make an image of the figure without a direct/transmission/reflected optical

path be combined with a  
plamonic/phonic crystal to create new  
kinds of detectors. **Combining  
quantum camera with plamonics  
creates new detectors and depth  
vision.** The phonons would migrate  
until they reached an edge or a crystal  
anomaly (from the crystal detecting  
something), then on reaching a crystal  
novelty-center would change and  
cause their different sibling quantum-  
linked phonon or plasmon, which was  
at the surface of a reader/sensor, like  
a computer camera (at the figurine  
example), to be specifically quantum  
polarized (possible spin polarized)  
from entanglement; that images the  
3d shape as well as likely the energy  
level and form of the thing the first  
plasmon reacts to. **This is a way of  
seeing at depth of materials,  
possibly 3d computer chips,** or  
even cytomaterials or tissues as when

you put a nanosized plasmon generating crystal next to a cyte, then the nanocrystal makes propagating phonons/plamons which wash up and possibly penetrate the cytomembrane and cytostructure, while what they see/react to is recorded from the quantum camera effect.

One vague idea I have about reading plamonics/phonons at a perimeter or edge is that little or large organic molecules could have a plasmonic representation; say the edge of a quiltlike plasmon just touches the edge of a little organic molecule, like a carbohydrate. The quilt hops around the carbohydrate molecule, Near-touching, plasmonically/phononically modifying the plamon-quilt, without reacting chemically with the carbohydrate. So rather than an atomic force microscope tip, the

plasmonic quilt changes its internal plasmon matrix (possibly an actively computing matrix like a cellular automata) at each of the c-c-c of the carbohydrate. The carbohydrate goes unreacted but it is read/stored plasmonically. Just for niftyness: I read about a time crystal at wikipedia, sort of a crystal with more than one stable ground state so it automatically rotates through states; so **a plasmonic/phononic time crystal could iterate the matrix-quilt while transporting measurements to a quilt-internal or external computer/sensor.**

**Math of statistics and finding things out:** A human looking at a map of US states and counties can tell which are the richest. Then, as a lay perceptor, I think humans do actual

math correlations/other equations and/or just gaze at the way overlain data sets fit. People looking at previously uncombined data sets sometimes find new (perceived) trends which can then be tested as hypothesis.

database comparisons as **instantaneous statements of matrix data** are reminiscent of finding actual predictive relationships at data, that could be tested, or have highly unique probability of occurring other than by chance (like a P value, but better and nonspecific); So looking at the counties you could predict college attendance by county wealth, even if you were absent a theory as to why.

So that brings up the math of what is **the minimal matrix or block size**

**to make a 2d map overlain on an integer dataset.** Like, how good a tic-tac-toe board or hexagonal tile plane do you need to get a semivisual guide to data 1) where a human glancing at the visual it would see a trend (fMRI) 2) where an AI, like a deep learning AI, would imitate a human glancing and find a trend, and 3) where some actual math at an actual formula would find a trend (like multimodality or even east-west gradient at tic tac toe board) parsimoniously from less data.

**So are there entire areas of the observable universe that fulfill the math of hypothesisless true correlation?** These might be an area of science, and the technology that comes from it, that are particularly easy and effective to investigate. This brings up a new

(undecidability notation) form of D3 island of truthiness; an physics and other science actual area separate from deduction or induction.

My perception is that some of science, like physics, uses reduction (simplification) to produce predictable, modellable components, like electrons or photons or math-fields, then build up larger things from these; the esteem goes to the theories that most effectively build up models that accurately predict the observed universe. That process reminds me of a combination of induction and deduction. That said if math areas of hypothesisless correlation create islands of truthiness (D3) completely outside and different than induction and/or deduction then there could be a restatement of physics, and new physics research, based on math



areas of hypothesisless truthiness.  
The only one  
(math;hypothesisless;truthiness) that I  
think of instantly is the dubious (yet  
possibly testable): Math winnowing of  
anthropic principle variants at a  
multiverse kind of set-theory implies:  
If you perceive you exist, then it must  
be at a physics that permits that.

**Now testability matters, notably  
at core, as there is not way to tell  
if an actual existing system is  
constructed in part with a non-  
hypothesisless math component.  
Keep doing the science  
experiments.**

### **Math entertainment:**

Math Description of a universe where  
correlation is always causation; then  
finding areas at our universe-we-live-  
in that have or approximate that

mathematical set-up.

Looking at a map of US counties colored on wealth, then comparing any other thing to it might often generate *testable* hypothesis. That is normal during 2019 AD. Are there truth regions possible without a hypothesis? Areas of validity without doing a subsequent experiment based on measuring the new hypothesis? That would be really different, and kind of like finding (math/data) places of accurate knowledge (at undecidability notation a new kind of D3 local-truth island); The thing is, could there be a math description of a simple matrix, like a tic tac toe board, where to have two matrices compared the **statistics-equations would always have to be true**, that is like doing the math the P value would always definitionally be  $p=0.0$ . At

such a math space if you saw any data trend with your human vision it would always be certain, rather than competitive with chance, and would always be true; Interestingly no hypothesis is necessary to then make a statement about the system, “Rich counties have more plastic cards” or something. Also, even if the math works, **it might not be a hypothesisless certainty** because the Godel incompleteness theorem and the Quoran’s statement that addition and multiplication are math unprovable as to repeatability, so only for certain assumptions of mathematics would hypothesisless “true” correlations exist.

**It would be great to find or make big datasets, with the math permitted hypothesisless correlations which were**

**mathematical-space definitionally true.** Those equations derived from the data could then be used predictively at what might be entirely new datasets with the same math-matrix-true math organization (or of course you could just process the first 10% of a big dataset. find the “hypothesisless truthiness effects” and then isolate those “truelike” areas or data of interest at the other 90% of the data set.

**Could sensors be built around hypothesisless matrix-true math;** these physical sensors could then make something like an image (like self-driving car video) where if you can predict it, with any, of a group of equations, it is true.

**Could there be a new kind of statistical process control based**

## **on a math of hypothesisles true correlation spaces?**

Encouraging new physics technologies and hypothesis; Could big physics, like colliders, have a math-built-in setup so at experiments constructed a certain way, if it was measured, you could know it exists, as compared with making a dozen (gravity waves) to a few billion (lasers) measurements to compare/contrast to stochastics of chance. “Well, we constructed the new physics experiment out of two tic-tac-toe boards; overlain, if we see anything, with computers or our human vision, it’s mathematically supported as an actual effect. I think an engineer might point out that the math of your gravity wave detector might be tight but an oversize load truck driving above it could instantly make the plurality of measurements,

at a preexisting math of unlikely-to-be-chance, the better guiding math.

**MWI:**

**Can a person define or generate a multiverse universe with the math of predictive certainty, absent generating and verifying a hypothesis, with a defined or undefined future?** That could make “create once, run well, terminate predictably and well” universes, with or without sentience. Can sentience be created in a math-space universe where if it can be thought, it is true (hypothesisless certainty); this provides benefit to the inhabitants as they are always right, about everything, no matter what they think. Noting nonrepeating cellular automata from simple things like the 1,1,0 guide, such that at a: if you can think it, it’s true; form of universe, it

could/would still be continually generating fresh previously unknown beneficial material. That gives what we will call “people” or “humans” the ability to always be right at thoughts, yet be nondetermined and “unclockworklike” at their perceived universe.

“People looking at previously uncombined data sets sometimes find new (perceived) trends which can then be tested as hypothesis.”

Ok, so how is hypothesisless truthiness different than the “=” symbol in an equation? Also, are there non-turing cellular automata, different than 1,1,0 (Wolfram company) turing automata, that create D3 regions of hypothesisless truthiness? These non-turing-computers that produce

regions of truth are ways of finding something out, yet, are computer-science expanding and alluring because they are non-turing machines.

**If you embed a non-turing cellular automata inside another non-turing automata, do you get a self-editing system that can edit itself to produce an output rather than using a loop?** These could be Instant-math (as compared with iterating) problem solvers. One possibility (like perturbing one tiny branchlet of a fractal with the preference of changing the macrostructure of the entire fractal) is to rewrite the surrounding automata1 with the average, or mode, of the internal nested (embedded) automata2. That causes the most frequent output (mode) of automata2



to completely reshape automata1  
which its subset automata2  
generates. I somehow think that if you  
rewrite the surrounding structure with  
the mode of automata2 that this  
differs from computer-science  
recursion. So I think the idea  
generally is to do computing without a  
turing machine, and to change big  
things with tiny modifications at a  
branch.

Ok, just to do some quora-based  
reacting, it seems like the vast  
majority of things at the observable  
universe that get measured have  
multi-item multicomponent parts.  
There is even the notion that the  
normal distribution (frequent at  
things) is sourced from basic  
combinatorics. So when physicists  
and others make an effort to describe  
a newly measured or theorized system

like the multiverse, is presuming things like “a flat universe, or a round universe” missing out as a result of simplification (simplify to build constructables from)? Is there a math and theory legitimate way to note, previously inductively\*, that middle complexity is the usual thing, so a testable middle complexity theory could have value? Big computers, deep learning and AI could possibly start with nearer to middle complexity new models of new physics measurements, technologies, and new physics theories and then isolate their heightened predictive ability from a middle-complexity theory source. “instead of radiating from a point source, an origin universe radiates from multiple sources, metaphorically similar to a distribution gaussian of Boltzmann brains” as a comic yet nifty version. As I am

writing things for online publishing It is my duty to be accurate and earnest, yet I am amused with the idea that boltzmann brains, each with their own anthropic principle zone, expand towards each other, then the ones that get along together persist, causing peace in the multiverse.

\*I note “previously inductively” because (repeat measurements -> induction featuring math improvements) yet if mathematically constructable hypothesisless correlators (where correlation, at those specific systems, from the parsimoniousness of the math, possibly matrix-math causes correlation to always = causation at that definitional space) can create math spaces in utilized physics, theoretical physics, and technologized objects, then **those new things are**

**outside induction and deduction;  
that seems new to me and could  
be useful.**

Possible reply: because FEA (finite element analysis) works: the aggregates of minimal descriptions actually are predictive. Being predictive they have value. If you presume middle-complexity, modellability from parts (even FEA or theories built around collections of definitional minimal sized forms); still, middle complexity forms could have value and/or be better predictors. think of some zig-zaggy squares mde with pinking shears; you can tessellate those, so metaphorically middle-complexity object-chunks can have predictive capacity at various fabrics, including theories.

I can see how AI can improve physics and the technologies that arise from

it.

Is there a middle complexity math thing (thus possibly a physics thing) that you could not find from testing or aggregating mini-components, that actually exists and influences the human experienced universe? Say the idea of a gaussian, as the actual collection of points. It does have predictive power, but you might not! Every position is determined based on a set of individual measurements of the components.

Another area of middle complexity might be (creating/explaining) emergent properties- although, minimized component definitions are not something I'm writing about with a tropism towards expanding beyond them, it would be nice if emergent properties, rather than just generating a catalog of new emergent

properties, possibly even one  
generated at an AI that makes vast  
quantities of permitted shapes “while  
you were modeling a spherical point,  
the AI itself said “probably” or “Hey,  
non-orientable surface!”  
producing a brief catalog of new  
emergent properties that could  
then arise. The AI or Software is  
producing a whole bunch  
of “medium complexity” data  
primitives as compared with building  
up from “simple” elements.

But  
[dx306080]tx576001Sn what physical  
systems could be hypothesized? At  
a0ploNkiss level, Ham reminded of  
the idea that if you can make  
things move like atoms, then the math-  
based description of those systems,  
and (thickness-at<matter) math  
regions where

corrgladkonalwaysc=causcTion, might  
be Auvo□atic.

Everettiq~ man sorlts,0as0l perceifE  
it, comes from making the math  
funation At the schroedinggR  
eluation. Sn yt is at!leact a  
noniduCtivu adh-space. Dten though  
thyngs like the schrNedinGer  
equauion onli prefict uhey hierogen  
atmm0+"1th century AT!version( Y  
once dhoughT, among\$other  
@oscibhlhties,thAt!cince!MWI  
ddpEnds on tie sciroEdinger equavion,  
anf txe sChP